

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to communications filed on 12/31/2007.
2. Claims 6 and 8-11 have been presented for examination.
3. Claims 6 and 8-11 have been rejected.

Response to Arguments

4. Regarding the previous 35 USC 102 (c) type rejections, the applicant primarily argues that the cited reference Morgan et al fails to disclose one of a flash memory or another non-volatile storage medium addressed using electrical contacts, and is not connected to a computer using "a Universal Serial Bus interface", as recited in Applicant's claim 6. The applicant further argues, Morgan et al fails to disclose "enabling access to the at least one application only if the computer recognizes said individual identifier", because Morgan allows restricted access if the identifier is not recognized.

In response to the applicant's above arguments, they are fully considered, however, found not persuasive because reference Morgan et al was found to teach, or at least suggesting enablement of limitations set forth by above arguments (please see the office action below). Moreover, upon further search, new grounds of rejection were found, and the applicant's arguments are now moot in view of new grounds of rejection presented in this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which

Art Unit: 2136

it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 6 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In particular, claims 6 and 8-11 recite the limitations “wherein the transportable storage medium is one of a flash memory or another non-volatile storage medium addressed using electrical contacts” that were not found anywhere in originally submitted claim-set, or specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 6 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Morgan et al (US 6968459 B1) or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Shmueli et al (US 6986030 B2)

Regarding claim 6, Morgan et al teaches a method for providing access to at least one application of a computer by an access protection system, comprising:

connecting to a Universal Serial Bus interface on the computer a transportable storage medium which electronically stores an individual identifier (Col 3, line 5 to Col 4, line 67; Col 5, line 47 to Col 6, line 62; Claim 39,42; connecting removable storage device/ access card; device

specific security information/ identifier/ serial number; Morgan et al (Col 2, line 50-Col 3, line 17) teaches connecting a removable media drive or SuperDisk to the computer; The examiner interprets that such flash memory or removable media drive or SuperDisk are usually USB port/ interface compatible, and therefore, Morgan et al suggests enablement of flash memory that is USB interface compatible); and

enabling access to the at least one application only if the computer recognizes said individual identifier (Col 1, line 35 to Col 2, line 4; Col 3, line 56 to Col 7, line 39; Claim 1,6, 39,42; storage device as access card; permitting access to computer based on storage device specific security information/ identifier/ serial number, or the key generated from storage device specific information),

wherein the transportable storage medium is one of a flash memory or another non-volatile storage medium addressed using electrical contacts (Col 2, line 50-Col 3, line 17), and the Universal Serial Bus interface connects the transportable storage medium to one of a CPU, a monitor, a keyboard, and at least one peripheral device of the computer (Col 2, line 59 to Col 3, line 50).

However, in the case, position for inherency is not found supportable, the examiner notes, reference Shmucli et al teaches connecting to a Universal Serial Bus interface on the computer a transportable storage medium for enabling access to the at least one application (Fig 2; Col 4, lines 23-67; Col 15, lines 25-37; portable key)

Shmucli et al and Morgan et al are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of secure application access. At the time of invention, it will be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Shmucli et al with Morgan et al to method further including the step of connecting to a Universal Serial Bus interface on the computer a

transportable storage medium for enabling access to the applications in order to provide user's with alternative mechanisms.

Regarding claim 8, Morgan et al. teaches the method wherein said individual identifier is the serial number of the transportable storage medium (Col 5, line 46 to Col 6, line 35; Claim 1,6, 39,42; storage device specific/ manufacturing serial number).

Regarding claim 9, Morgan et al. teaches the method wherein said individual identifier is stored in the computer (Col 5, line 46 to Col 6, line 35; Claim 1,6, 39,42).

Regarding claim 10, Morgan et al. teaches method wherein said individual identifier enables access to all applications in the computer (Col 1, line 35 to Col 2, line 4; Col 3, line 56 to Col 7, line 39; Claim 1,6, 39,42; permitting full/ restricted access to computer).

Regarding claim 11, Morgan et al. teaches method wherein said individual identifier enables access to at least one pre-designated application in the computer (Col 1, line 35 to Col 2, line 4; Col 3, line 56 to Col 7, line 39; Claim 1,6, 39,42; permitting full/ restricted access to computer).

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the

mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shanto M Z Abedin whose telephone number is 571-272-3551. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Moazzami Nasser, can be reached on 571-272-4195. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shanto M Z Abedin
Examiner, AU 2136

/Nasser G Moazzami/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2136